#### MEDICAL DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION

PART I: GENERAL INFORMATION	
<b>Type of Requestor:</b> (x) HCP () IE () IC	<b>Response Timely Filed?</b> () Yes (x) No
Requestor's Name and Address Edward Wolski, M.D. / Wol+Med	MDR Tracking No.: M4-03-8869-01
2436 I-35 South, Ste. 336	TWCC No.:
Denton TX 75205	Injured Employee's Name:
Respondent's Name and Address BOX #: 39	Date of Injury:
Lumbermens Mutual Casualty Co. c/o Flahive Ogden & PO Box 13367	Employer's Name: Georgia Pacific Corporation
Austin TX 78711	Insurance Carrier's No.: A26460476100010164

## PART II: SUMMARY OF DISPUTE AND FINDINGS (Details on Page 2, if needed)

Dates of Service		CPT Code(s) or Description	Amount in Dispute	Amount Due	
From	То	Ci i Couc(s) of Description	Amount in Dispute	Amount Duc	
9/19/02	9/24/02	99203, 72110-WP, 97139-PH, 99070, 95831-MT, 97024,97032,	\$651.00	\$259.00	

## PART III: REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY

DATE: 8/11/03 "...Our position regarding the denials are as follows: 1) DOS 9/19/02 - 9/24/02 – the carrier failed to respond to our initial billing as per... carrier failed to respond again...However, we have now received our first notice from the carrier regarding these DOS, and they incorrectly denied payment...with "D" for duplicate billing..."

# PART IV: RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY

DATE: A response was not received by TWCC-MDR from the Respondent in reference to this medical reimbursement dispute.

#### PART V: MEDICAL DISPUTE RESOLUTION REVIEW SUMMARY, METHODOLOGY, AND/OR EXPLANATION

- On 7/24/03, MDR received the Requestor's request for reimbursement of treatment/services rendered from 9/19/02 through 9/24/02 to the injured worker.
- The Requestor provided convincing evidence that the HCFA's were submitted for reimbursement and reconsideration to the Respondent according to 133.304(k).
- According to Rule 133.304 (1), the Respondent did not respond to the reconsideration request.
- After review of the information received the following conclusions have been determined:

According to 133.304 (c), the Respondent did not provide explanation to allow the sender to understand the reason for the lack of payment. Therefore the disputed DOS will be reviewed for fee issues and reimbursed according to the 1996 MFG / MAR. Reimbursement recommended as follows:

DOS	CPT Code		Amount due:
9/19/02:	99203	Convincing evidence submitted to support services rendered	\$74.00
	72110-WP	(\$22.00+\$34.00) Report attached.	\$56.00
	97139-PH	(DOP) Rule 133.307 (g)(3)(D) was not supported.	\$ 0.00

970 970 9/20/02: 9583 990 970 970	(DOP) Rule 133.307 (g)(3)(D) w	to support services rendered \$21.00 to support services rendered \$22.00 ccording to CPT descriptor \$0.00 was not supported \$0.00
970 9/20/02: 9585 990 970 970	Convincing evidence submitted to Report not received for review as (DOP) Rule 133.307 (g)(3)(D) w	to support services rendered \$22.00  ccording to CPT descriptor \$0.00  vas not supported \$0.00
9/20/02: 9585 990 970 970	Report not received for review ac (DOP) Rule 133.307 (g)(3)(D) w	ccording to CPT descriptor \$ 0.00 was not supported \$ 0.00
990 970 970	(DOP) Rule 133.307 (g)(3)(D) w	vas not supported \$ 0.00
970 970	( )	* *
970	Convincing evidence submitted to	. 1 1 001 00
	$\mathcal{E}$	o support services rendered \$21.00
971	Convincing evidence submitted to	o support services rendered \$22.00
	Recent review of disputes involving	ing CPT Code 97110 by the Medical Dispu
with respect to the individual service	tion indicate overall deficiencies in the adeq the medical necessity of one-on-one therapy rices were provided as billed. Moreover, the ne-on-one." Therefore, consistent with the go	y and documentation reflecting that these e disputes indicate confusion regarding what

not clearly delineate exclusive one-on-one treatment nor did the requestor identify the severity of the injury to warrant exclusive one-to-one therapy. Additional reimbursement not recommended.

9/21/02:	97139-PH	(DOP) Rule 133.307 (g)(3)(D) Convincing evidence in the clinical notes did	
		not support services were rendered.	\$ 0.00
	99070	(DOP) Rule 133.307 (g)(3)(D) Convincing evidence in the clinica	l notes did
		not support services were rendered.	\$ 0.00
	97024	Convincing evidence submitted to support services rendered.	\$21.00
	97032	Convincing evidence submitted to support services rendered.	\$22.00
9/24/02:	97139-PH	(DOP) Rule 133.307 (g)(3)(D) was not supported in clinical notes.	\$ 0.00

TOTAL DUE: **\$259.00** 

PART VI: COMMISSION DECISION AND OR	RDER	
Based upon the review of the disputed hear entitled to additional reimbursement in the remit this amount plus all accrued interest Order.	e amount of \$259.00. The Division hereb	y <b>ORDERS</b> the insurance carrier to
		7 / 7 / 05
Authorized Signature	Name	Date of Order
PART V: YOUR RIGHT TO REQUEST A HE	ARING	
Either party to this medical dispute may disfor a hearing must be in writing and it must (twenty) days of your receipt of this decision care provider and placed in the Austin Rep days after it was mailed and the first working Texas Administrative Code § 102.5(d)). A PO Box 17787, Austin, Texas, 78744 or far The party appealing the Division's Decision involved in the dispute.  Si prefiere hablar con una persona in establishment.	ust be received by the TWCC Chief Clerk fon (28 Texas Administrative Code § 148.3 presentatives box on This ing day after the date the Decision was placed request for a hearing should be sent to: Caxed to (512) 804-4011. A copy of this Distriction shall deliver a copy of their written results.	x of Proceedings/Appeals Clerk within 20 (3). This Decision was mailed to the health is Decision is deemed received by you five ced in the Austin Representative's box (28 Chief Clerk of Proceedings/Appeals Clerk, Decision should be attached to the request.
PART IX: INSURANCE CARRIER DELIVER	Y CERTIFICATION	
I hereby verify that I received a copy of the Signature of Insurance Carrier:		